

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Advisory Action mailed May 19, 2005. In order to advance prosecution of the present Application, Claims 1, 19, and 20 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

The Examiner issued a Final Action on March 1, 2005. Applicant submitted a Response to Examiner's Final Action on May 1, 2005. The Examiner issued an Advisory Action on May 19, 2005 stating that the Response to Examiner's Final Action would not be entered because it raised new issues requiring further searching and consideration. Applicant respectfully requests continued examination of this Application so that the Response to Examiner's Final Action be entered and considered by the Examiner pursuant to this Request for Continued Examination. For the convenience of the Examiner, the amendments made to the claims in the Response to Examiner's Final Action and the accompanying comments are repeated herein.

Claim 19 stands objected to for a minor informality. Claim 19 has been amended to address the informality identified by the Examiner.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 19 has been amended to address matters raised by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 19 is in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Belair in view of Albert, et al. Independent Claims 1, 19, and 20 recite in general the ability to allocate particular client NAT addresses of a client NAT address range to a subpool and ensure that the particular client NAT addresses in the client NAT address

range remain allocated within the subpool until all of the particular addresses within the client NAT address range of the subpool have been freed. By contrast, the Belair patent is directed to memory address reuse using a shadow memory and a translation lookaside buffer partitioned within a cache memory of a processor. Thus, the Belair patent is unconcerned with client NAT address allocation. Moreover, the translation lookaside buffer of the Belair patent does not provide a subpool where a plurality of client NAT addresses remain allocated until each client NAT address in the subpool are freed. The Albert, et al. patent merely discloses a technique for network address translation and does not include any additional disclosure combinable with the Belair patent that would be material to patentability of these claims. as a result, the proposed combination of the Belair and Albert, et al. patents still lack an ability to allocate particular client NAT addresses of a client NAT address range to a subpool and ensure that the particular client NAT addresses in the client NAT address range remain allocated within the subpool until all of the particular addresses within the client NAT address range of the subpool have been freed as provided in the claimed invention. Support for the above recitation can be found at page 14, line 20, to page 18, line 26, of Applicant's specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 9-11, 19, and 20 are patentably distinct from the proposed Belair - Albert, et al. combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that the previously issued Final Action was premature in that the support for the final rejection was based on completely different and newly cited art than the art used in the First Office Action. Applicant did not submit the newly cited art and was only applied by the Examiner in the Final Action even though it was available to

the Examiner at the time of the First Office Action. See Applicant's remarks provided in the Response to Examiner's Final Action. The Examiner has not provided any justification for the finality of the Final Action. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner waive any fees associated with this Request for Continued Examination so that a non-final Office Action can be properly issued pursuant to the procedures of the M.P.E.P.

In the event that the Examiner refuses to waive the fee for this Request for Continued Examination despite the improper issuance of a Final Action in this Application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge an amount of \$790.00 to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. to satisfy the request for continued examination fee of 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e).

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Charles S. Fish', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

June 1, 2005

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 05073